

# Strong Phases in the Decays $B$ to $D\pi$

Lincoln Wolfenstein

Department of Physics, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213

February 1, 2008

## Abstract

The observed strong phase difference of  $30^\circ$  between  $I = \frac{3}{2}$  and  $I = \frac{1}{2}$  final states for the decay  $B \rightarrow D\pi$  is analyzed in terms of rescattering like  $D^*\pi \rightarrow D\pi$ , etc. It is concluded that for the decay  $B^0 \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$  the strong phase is only about  $10^\circ$ . Implications for the determination of  $\sin(2\beta + \gamma)$  are discussed.

The weak decay amplitude to a specific final state can be written as  $Ae^{i\delta}$  where  $A$  is the decay amplitude, in general complex, and  $\delta$  is the "strong phase". For a final eigenstate  $\delta$  is simply the elastic scattering phase in accordance with the Watson theorem. For the case of  $B$  decays the final scattering is primarily inelastic;  $\delta$  arises from the absorptive part of the decay amplitude corresponding to a weak decay to intermediate states followed by a strong scattering to the final state. Many papers have discussed the expected size of  $\delta$  [1].

Recently data has suggested a significant non-zero phase for the decays  $\bar{B}$  to  $D\pi$  [2]. These decays can be analyzed in terms of two amplitudes  $A_3 e^{i\delta_3}$  and  $A_1 e^{i\delta_1}$  corresponding to the final isospin states  $\frac{3}{2}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$ . The amplitudes for the three decays of interest are the following:

$$A_{o-} = A(D^0 \pi^-) = A_3 e^{i\delta_3} \quad (1a)$$

$$A_{+-} = A(D^+ \pi^-) = \frac{1}{3} A_3 e^{i\delta_3} + \frac{2}{3} A_1 e^{i\delta_1} \quad (1b)$$

$$A_{oo} = A(D^0 \pi^0) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} (A_3 e^{i\delta_3} - A_1 e^{i\delta_1}) \quad (1c)$$

The experimental result gives the ratio of decay probabilities

$$D^0\pi^-:D^+\pi^-:D^0\pi^0 = 46:27:2.9$$

From this one deduces

$$\frac{A_1}{A_3} = 0.69, \quad \cos(\delta_3 - \delta_1) = 0.86 \quad (2)$$

Thus we find approximately a 30 degree phase difference, significantly different from zero. We discuss here the implications of such a phase difference; there remain, of course, sizable errors on this value.

We now make the assumption that the major rescattering comes from states of the form  $D_i^+\pi_j^-$  such as  $D^{*+}\pi^-$ ,  $D^+\rho^-$ , etc.[3] [4] Such states are expected in factorization and about 10% of the  $b$  to  $u\bar{c}d$  transitions have been identified to be of this type. It is much less likely that complicated many-particle states should rescatter to  $D\pi$ .

We consider first the simple factorization (large  $N_c$ ) limit:

$$A_{+-} = A_{o-} \quad A_{oo} = 0$$

Here the  $\pi^-$  is assumed to come directly from the  $\bar{u}d$  current, the amplitudes are real and there is no  $D^0\pi^0$  decay. This corresponds to  $A_3 = A_1 = A$ . We now add rescattering from states of the form  $D_i^+\pi_j^-$ . We label these amplitudes  $X_3$  and  $X_1$  and again  $X_3 = X_1$ . The most obvious rescattering occurs via the exchange of an isospin 1 particle, either  $\pi$  or  $\rho$ . As a result the rescattering amplitude is proportional to  $\tau_i \cdot T_j$  with the values  $(\frac{1}{2}, -1)$  for  $I = (\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ . The resultant imaginary amplitudes

$$\frac{\text{Im } A_3}{\text{Im } A_1} = \frac{X_3 (\frac{1}{2})}{X_1 (-1)} = -\frac{1}{2} \quad (3)$$

Considering the  $\text{Im } A_i$  as fairly small, this means

$$\delta_1 = -2\delta_3 \quad (4a)$$

If we use the empirical value  $(\delta_3 - \delta_1) = 30^\circ$

$$\delta_3 = 10^\circ \quad \delta_1 = -20^\circ \quad (4b)$$

and to lowest order in  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_3$

$$\begin{aligned} A_{o-} &= Ae^{i\delta_3} \quad , \quad A_{+-} = Ae^{-i\delta_3} \\ A_{oo} &= \sqrt{2} \quad iA \delta_3 \end{aligned}$$

Thus the phase difference of  $30^\circ$  corresponds to a fairly small phase of magnitude  $10^\circ$  for both of the favored decays. Of course in this approximation the  $D^0\pi^0$  decay is purely imaginary entirely due to rescattering.

If we now use the empirical value  $A_1 = 0.7A_3 = 0.7A$  but still assume  $X_3 = X_1$ , we have using Eq. (1) to lowest order in  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_{3x}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} A_3 &= A + i \delta_3 A \\ A_1 &= 0.7A - 2i \delta_3 A \\ \delta_1 &= \frac{-2\delta_3}{0.7} \\ A_{+-} &= 0.8A - iA \delta_3 \end{aligned}$$

and with  $\delta_3 - \delta_1 = 30^\circ$  we get  $\delta_1 = -22^\circ$  ,  $\delta_3 = 8^\circ$  and the phase for  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$  is again  $10^\circ$ .

Finally if we also assume  $X_1 = 0.7 X_3$  we get Eqs. (4) again and

$$A_{+-} = 0.8A - i0.6A \delta_3$$

and the phase for  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$  is  $7.5^\circ$ .

Thus we conclude that  $(\delta_3 - \delta_1) = 30^\circ$  corresponds to a small phase of order  $10^\circ$  for  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$ . In contrast the phase for the unfavored decay  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^0\pi^0$  is greater than  $45^\circ$ . Similar results are implied by more detailed analysis [3].

One reason for the interest in the strong phase for  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$  is the possible use of this decay or the related decay  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$  in the determination of the phase  $\gamma$  in the CKM matrix. One can look at the time-dependence of the decay due to interference with the double-Cabibbo suppressed decay  $B \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$  which corresponds to  $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{u} + c + \bar{d}$ . The time-dependent term can be used [5] to find  $\sin(2\beta + \gamma)$ . The detailed analysis [6] [7] involves the strong phase  $\Delta$ , which is the difference between the strong phases for  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$  and that for  $B \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$ . There is an ambiguity in the result unless one can assume  $\Delta$  is small.

The same isospin analysis given for  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$  can be applied to  $B \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$  and one expects again that the final state phase is due to the same rescattering from states like  $D^*\pi$ ,  $D\rho$ , etc. The relative importance will be different for the case of  $B$  as compared to  $\bar{B}$ , but theoretical estimates [6] indicate the difference is not large. Thus  $\Delta$  is expected to involve a cancellation between the two strong phases and thus be smaller than either one. Given our conclusion that the phase for  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$  is of order  $10^\circ$  we conclude that  $\Delta$  is very small.

All the analysis here holds equally well for the decays to  $D^*\pi$ . In fact the experimental results [8] for the decays to  $D^*\pi$  are the same within errors as for  $D\pi$  and give essentially the same strong phase shift Eq. (2).

Decays in which the final  $\pi^-$  is replaced by a  $\rho^-$  are found to have a branching ratio 2 to 3 times as large as those with a  $\pi^-$ . Thus it may be expected that rescattering from states  $D_i\rho$  to  $D_i\pi$  may have a larger effect than  $D_i\pi$  to  $D_i\rho$ . Thus while our general analysis might be applicable to  $D_i\rho$  we expect the

magnitude of the strong phase shifts would be smaller. This seems to be true from the first data on the  $D^0\rho^0$  decay [9].

This research was supported in part by the Department of Energy under grant no. DE-FG02-91ER40682. Part of this work was carried out at the Aspen Center for Physics.

## References

- [1] M. Beneke et al, *Nuc. Phys. B* **591**, 313 (2000); M. Suzuki and L. Wolfenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 74019 (1999).
- [2] S. Ahmed et al [CLEO Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 031101 (R) (2002).
- [3] C.K. Chuva, W.S. Hou and K.C. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 09600 (2002).
- [4] The importance of such rescattering in  $B \rightarrow K\pi$  is discussed by A.F. Falk et. al, *Phys. Rev. D* **57**, 4290 (1998) and D. Atwood and A. Soni, *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 036005 (1998).
- [5] I. Dunietz, *Phys. Lett. B* **427**, 179 (1998) and references therein.
- [6] D.A. Suprun, C.W. Chiang and J.L. Rosner, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 054025 (2002).
- [7] J.P. Silva, A. Soffer, F. Wu, and L. Wolfenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 036004 (2003).
- [8] T.E. Coan et al [CLEO Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 062001 (2002); K. Abe et al [BELLE Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 052002 (2002).
- [9] A. Sapathy et al [BELLE Collaboration], *Phys. Lett. B* **553**, 159 (2003).